



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

minute. The introduction of the learned editor is devoted to an exhaustive vindication of the antiquity and authority of the *Fuero*, which leaves nothing to be desired except that he might have facilitated reference by a simple table of the rubrics of the several articles, and that a glossary of the words, for which the student may vainly search his *Ducange*, would have relieved the obscurity of some passages, for those not so familiar as himself with the medieval lore of Aragon.

HENRY CHARLES LEA.

John of Gaunt. By SYDNEY ARMITAGE-SMITH. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; London: Archibald Constable and Company, Ltd. 1905 [1904]. Pp. xxviii, 490.)

If we may trust the silence of the *Catalogue of the British Museum*, the present work is the first attempt at an extended biography of the Duke of Lancaster. Moreover, the difficulties of the subject being such as they are, the author is destined in all probability to hold this field for many years to come. It is of interest, therefore, to know that he regards John of Gaunt with somewhat more favor than the historian ordinarily who treats of this period of English history. He denies that John of Gaunt ever directed his ambition toward the English crown, but holds that his mind was always and at all times set on "continental sovereignty".

In support of his thesis, the author has brought to bear a knowledge of source-material which other workers may well envy. His results, moreover, in the main seem sound. We may fully admit that sufficient importance has not been given to the influence of the Spanish Marriage in shaping the policy of John of Gaunt's later life. The attempt, however, to reverse the accepted view of the duke's relations to English parties at home, and particularly to relieve him of all responsibility for the conditions that disgraced the last years of his father's reign, is not so satisfactory.

The author frankly admits that he finds no support for his view in the *Chronicle of St. Albans*. Now the *Chronicle of St. Albans* presents the only full account that we have of the last years of Edward III. It is, furthermore, unquestionably the work of a contemporary who was in close touch with some of the men who were trying to wrest the government from the corrupt ring who controlled its patronage. The author, however, claims that the chronicler is superstitiously credulous in the matter of dreams and portents and bitterly hostile to John of Gaunt, and that therefore he is "wholly untrustworthy" (p. 134), and his testimony is to be rejected altogether. Is this verdict sound? Adam of Usk, the "hard-headed lawyer and impartial critic" as Mr. Armitage-Smith styles him (p. xxvi), is guilty of folly quite as grave in his pedigree of the Mortimers as the dream of de la Hoo. Warkworth's *Womere waters and blazing comets tax our patience quite as seriously*. In fact, if we accept this canon of the author, we shall be forced to rule

out most of the favorite sources of English history from Baeda down to the *Annual Register*.

The hostility of the chronicler is a far more serious charge. His testimony is undoubtedly that of an enemy. But does an enemy never tell the truth? Mr. Armitage-Smith admits that the *Chronicle* reflects contemporary popular feeling toward the duke. Is there not then a core of facts to be discovered even in such testimony, to be carefully distinguished from the opinions of the writer, facts which in popular estimation justified the prevailing hostility and which the modern historian must not ignore in making his estimate of the life and character of John of Gaunt?

But even if the author be allowed to throw out of court in this summary fashion the chief witness for the prosecution, the question may still be fairly asked, Does he upon the evidence submitted free John of Gaunt from all responsibility for the presence of the unclean herd that befouled the court of Edward III.? To say that John of Gaunt did not appoint these ministers is hardly to the point, since the appointment of ministers was a function of the crown. It is scarcely nearer the mark to claim that because John of Gaunt was absent on the continent during much of the time when the corrupt lay ministry was in power, *i. e.*, from 1371 to 1376, he must have been a cipher in politics at home, without knowledge of the inner history of the council and hence without responsibility.

Now as a matter of fact during most of this period John of Gaunt was in England and not on the continent. In January, 1371, upon the retirement of the Black Prince, he had succeeded to the command in Aquitaine. But in December he followed the prince to England and remained at home until July, 1373. The author admits this, but gives us to understand that during these eighteen months there was little doing at home, that the year 1372 passed without a Parliament, and hence there was little opportunity for Lancaster to make his presence felt. Now there was not only a Parliament in 1372 but a very important one (*Rot. Parl.* 46 Edward III.). These months, moreover, were months of great activity on the part of the government. Enormous sums were raised for the war with France, and three separate expeditions, one led by John of Gaunt himself, were sent out from England in the vain hope of saving Aquitaine. In April, 1374, Lancaster returned home, not to leave England again until after the death of the king, save for two trips to Flanders, in both of which he was entrusted with diplomatic missions of the greatest importance.

John of Gaunt, therefore, could hardly have been ignorant of the character of the people who surrounded his father. Moreover, his own prominence in public service, his necessarily close connection with the men who were to finance his expeditions, force us to believe that if he did not actually support the ministers in their evil doings, he at least connived at their misdeeds. It is true that when the day of reckoning came, Lancaster made no effort to shield his father's ministers from

the wrath of the "Good Parliament". But it must be borne in mind that the leader of the reform movement was the Black Prince himself, who had risen from his sick-bed to purge his father's court, and that John of Gaunt feared his popular brother. When, however, six months later the Black Prince was dead, Lancaster broke his silence not to carry on his brother's work but to undo it, and to turn with marked vindictiveness upon the men who had been prominent in the support of the Black Prince. The author's explanation of this later conduct of the duke is ingenious but hardly convincing.

In his efforts to make out his case, the author has not forgotten the friendships of Lancaster, which it is claimed are inconsistent with the accepted view of his character. The use of Chaucer's name is unfortunate. Even waiving the question of the relationship of Philippa Chaucer and Catharine Swynford, the man who could thus lament the fall of Pedro the Cruel, the passing favorite of the English court—

"O noble, O worthy Pedro, glory of Spain,
Whom fortune held so high in majesty,"—

proves himself too much of a courtier to be other than blind to the serious faults of his patron (pp. 64-65). Of Wyclif's high mind and single heart, however, there can be no question. Yet the alliance of the two can hardly be cited as a voucher for the character of the duke, any more than the later Pitt-Newcastle alliance may be cited to prove that history has been in error in the verdict which she has passed upon Newcastle and his methods. A common cause makes strange bedfellows sometimes. That John of Gaunt ever comprehended the logical significance of Wyclif's teachings, or that he delighted in the character of the high-souled doctor, or that he supported him beyond the point where Wyclif ceased to be useful in plucking the fine feathers of the churchmen, does not appear.

Of minor matters it may be worth while to note that the title *El Justiciero* (the doer of justice) applied to Pedro (p. 65), so strangely out of keeping with all that we know of this Dahomey chief of the fourteenth century, was not conferred upon him until the days of the autocratic Ferdinand, when no one might speak ill of any king of Castile.

In describing the battle of "L'Espagnols sur Mer" (pp. 6-8), while claiming to follow Froissart, the author calls *La Salle du Roi* the flag-ship. The name of the king's ship is not given by Froissart. Moreover, the flag-ship could not have been *La Salle du Roi*, since the king is described by Froissart as passing by this ship in the course of the action. In describing the gay scene on board the king's ship on the eve of the battle, the author is evidently thinking of Drake on the historic Devonshire green, rather than the Edward of Froissart.

On p. 21—evidently an error of the proof-reader—1369 is given as the date of the death of John of Gaunt. It was the Duchess Blanche rather who died in 1369. Again, p. 10, the comment on the death of the

false queen of Edward II. hardly does justice to the fact that she had been kept a prisoner for twenty-eight years. The statement that Prince Edward received his famous christening at Crecy, a statement that has the support of no contemporary authority, ought not to be made without some qualification.

Besides the more obvious and accessible facts of John of Gaunt's career, to be noticed as of special value is the chapter upon the Lancastrian estates, in which, aided by a map which has evidently cost much labor, the author brings out quite clearly the many ramifications of the Lancastrian lands and their importance as a basis of Lancastrian political influence. So also may be noted the fact that the Beaufort from which the illegitimate family of Lancaster took its name was the Beaufort of Champagne and not of Anjou as commonly given. The full apology of Northumberland for his brutal insult to Lancaster in 1381, which Mr. Armitage-Smith has drawn from the unpublished Register of the Duchy of Lancaster, is here brought out for the first time; so also the important fact, which even Bishop Stubbs missed, that Michael de la Pole was the friend of Lancaster and not his enemy. The attempt, however, to clear up the strange charge brought against Lancaster in 1384 by the Carmelite friar, as the result of a vicious trick on the part of Oxford to destroy Lancaster, is hardly satisfactory. It is more reasonable to believe with the Monk of Evesham that the poor friar was the victim of his own hallucinations.

BENJAMIN TERRY.

England under the Tudors. By ARTHUR D. INNES. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: Methuen and Company. 1905. Pp. xix, 481.)

THIS is the fourth in chronological order and the second in date of publication of the six volumes which comprise Professor Oman's collaborate history of England. It is, as far as the present reviewer is aware, the first single volume to treat of the Tudor period as a whole. Its author has already put forth one book on a subject lying within the present field, and two others dealing with a later one.

It is obvious at a glance that the present work possesses a number of admirable qualities. In the first place the proportions are excellent. Of the 427 pages which compose the main part of the book, 58 are devoted to Henry VII., 128 to Henry VIII., 30 to Edward VI., 26 to Mary, and 185 to Elizabeth. It is totally free from theological bias; it is eminently fair-minded and just in its conception of the important characters of the period: the treatment of the reign of Mary is in this respect particularly admirable. It is a most useful volume for purposes of reference; it is easy to find facts in it; it is furnished with an excellent index and useful genealogical tables, maps, and appendixes on special topics.

A closer examination however reveals a wide discrepancy in knowledge, treatment, and expression between the first part of the book and the second. Certainly Mr. Innes is not seen at his best in his chapters